/

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

LADEL BAPTISTE HARRISON,

Defendant.

No. CR-03-0016-RHW

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS FOR DISMISSAL AND TO AMEND JUDGMENT

On November 17, 2011, this Court ordered Defendant to show cause why he should not be barred from continuing to file motions in this closed case. Since then he filed two additional motions without addressing the Court's order. Like his previous motions, these newest requests are incomprehensible. There is no cognizable basis for relief in the motions, and they are denied.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Although Defendant's direct appeals in this case ended in 2006, and his collateral attacks in 2008, in the past two months Defendant has submitted a Motion for Disclosure of Grand Jury Transcripts (ECF No. 213); a "Motion for Relation Back" (ECF No. 214), which the Court construed as a Motion for Reconsideration of its order denying Defendant relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2255; a Motion for the Appointment of Counsel (ECF No. 215); a Motion for Relief from Judgment (ECF No. 238), and two separate Motions for Reconsideration (ECF No. 221, 236). The Court issued reasoned orders denying each of these requests (ECF Nos. 213, 216, 229, 237, 239). Both this Court and the Ninth Circuit declined to issue certificates of appealability. (ECF No. 242).

 $\label{eq:linear_problem} Q.\accin MINAL\2003\\\ackless Harrison, Ladel (MTS, ACCA)\\\ackless deny. dismissal. ord. wpd$ 

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Defendant's Motions for Dismissal of Actions (ECF No. 240) and to Amend Judgment (ECF No. 243) are **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.** The District Court Executive is hereby directed to enter this order and to furnish copies to counsel and Defendant.

**DATED** this 30<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2011.

s/Robert H. Whaley ROBERT H. WHALEY United States District Judge